| | 1116 | (A) | ~~~ | | - | | _ | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| S JS 44 (Rev. 12/07) (cand re The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the by local rules of court. This form the civil docket sheet. (SFF INS) | 1988 4:08-CV-UT21 to information contained her approved by the Judicial (| 1-CVVI V IDO ein neither replace n Conference of the Un | or suppler nited State | ment the filing and s | service of | pleadings or other papers as re | edured by law, except | t as provided of initiating | |
| the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | | DEFENDANTS | | | | | |
| PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY | | | | THOMAS KNOWLES and THOMAS HICKS | | | | | |
| (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) | | | | County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. | | | | | |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) | | | | Attorneys (If Known) | | | | | |
| SUSAN T. KUMAGAI, ESQ. (State Bar No. 127667) LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP 100 Spear Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, California 94105 Telephone: (415) 357-4600, Facsimile: (415) 357-4605 | | | | DANIEL B. BECK, ESQ. (SBN 63865) BECK LAW, P.C. 2681 Cleveland Avenue, Santa Rosa, California 95403 Tel: (707) 576-7175, Fax: (707) 576-187 | | | | | |
| II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) | | | | III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) | | | | | |
| 1 U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) | | | Citi | PTF DEF PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State | | | | | |
| 2 U.S. Government 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) | | | Citi | izen of Another State | 2 | 2 Incorporated and Print of Business In Air | | 5 | |
| N. NATURE OF CHIT | | | | izen or Subject of a Foreign Country | 3 | 3 Foreign Nation | 6 | 6 | |
| IV. NATURE OF SUIT CONTRACT | | ORTS | | FORFEITURE/PI | FNALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STA | TUTES | |
| 110 Insurance | PERSONAL INJURY | PERSONAL IN | | 610 Agriculture | ENALIT | 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 | 400 State Reapport | | |
| 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment | 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability | 362 Personal Inj Med. Malpr 365 Personal Inj | actice [| 620 Other Food & 625 Drug Related of Property 2 | Seizure | 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 | 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Ban 450 Commerce 460 Deportation | | |
| & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act | | Product Lial | rsonal [| 640 R.R. & Truck | : | PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights | 470 Racketeer Influence | | |
| 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans | 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine | Injury Produ Liability PERSONAL PRO | į. | 660 Occupational Safety/Health | | 830 Patent 840 Trademark | 480 Consumer Cre | sd it | |
| (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment | 345 Marine Product Liability | 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Len | | 690 Other | | SOCIAL SECURITY | 810 Selective Serv | | |
| of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits | 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle | 380 Other Person Property Da | | 710 Fair Labor Sta | | 861 HIA (1395ff) | Exchange 875 Customer Cha | | |
| ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise | Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury | 385 Property Da | mage | Aèt/ 720 Labor/Mgmt. | Relations | 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DJWC/DJWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI | 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutor | y Actions | |
| REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation | CIVIL RIGHTS | PRISONE PETITION | CR NS | & Disclosure 740 Railway Labo 790 Other Labor I | Act or Act | 865 RSI (405(g)) | 892 Economic State 893 Environmental 894 Energy Alloca | bilization Ac l Matters | |
| 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment | 442 Employment 443 Housing/ | Sentence Habeas Corpus | | 791 Empl. Ret. Inc Security Act | c. | FEDERAL TAX SUITS | 895 Freedom of In | formation | |
| 240 Torts to Land | Accommodations 444 Welfare | 530 General 535 Death Penal | | • | | 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) | 900Appeal of Fee Determination | 1 | |
| 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property | 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - | - 🗖 540 Mandamus 8 | | IMMIGRAT | ION | 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 | Under Equal A to Justice | Access | |
| | Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 440 Other Civil Rights | 446 Amer. w/Disabilities – 555 Prison Con Other | | 463 Habeas Corpu Alien Detains | 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus – Alien Detainee 465 Other Immigration Actions | 28 030 7809 | 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes | | |
| 1 Original 2 Remo | | anded from 🔲 | 4 Reinsta Reoper | Transited or 5 ano | sferred fro ther distri- cify) | | Appeal to I 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment | | |
| | I | | - | | urisdictio | onal statutes unless diversit | y): | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO | N Section 301 of the Brief description of o Petition to Vacate | cause: | | HOUS ACT | | | | | |
| VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 | | | | JURY DEMA | | | only if demanded in complaint: | | |
| VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY | PLEASE REFEI | R TO CIVIL L.R. : ELATED CASE | 3-12 CON Know | NCERNING REQUES/Hicks v. PGE | UIREME and IBE | EW, Case No. C07-2284-0 | CW | | |
| IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGN (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE | | | | FRANCISCO/OA | KLANI | SAN JOSE | | | |
| DATE | | SIGNATURE | ATTORN | NEY OF RECORD | | | | | |

& KUMAGAI LLP

LAFAYETTE

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
100 SPEAR STREET, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
(415) 357-4600
FAX (415) 357-4605

21

22

24

25

26 27

28

Petitioner Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("Petitioner" or "PG&E") respectfully requests an order vacating an interim arbitration award issued by Norman Brand of the American Arbitration Association. The underlying arbitration was initiated by Respondents Thomas Knowles ("Knowles") and Thomas Hicks ("Hicks") (collectively "Respondents"). The ground

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

for vacating the Interim Award is that the Arbitrator acted in manifest disregard of the law when he found that Respondents' state law claims for alleged breach of oral agreement and violation of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing are arbitrable and not preempted under Section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act., 29 U.S.C. §§185 et seq. ("LMRA").

Petitioner seeks to vacate the Interim Award pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. §§10 et seq. and a stay of the arbitration proceedings pending the motion to vacate the Interim Award.

Petitioner respectfully alleges as follows:

PARTIES

- Petitioner PG&E is a regulated utility that provides gas and electric power to 1. Northern and Central California. PG&E is a California corporation with its principal place of business in San Francisco, California.
- 2. Respondents Knowles and Hicks are former PG&E employees. They were employed as Fleet Maintenance Mechanics and were members of a bargaining unit represented by the Local Union Number 1245 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers ("IBEW"). While employed by PG&E, Knowles and Hicks' employment was governed by the terms of an agreement between Pacific Gas and Electric Company and the IBEW ("the CBA").

JURISDICTION

3. This Court has jurisdiction to adjudicate this petition pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. §10(a), because this matter presents a federal question as to the interpretation and applicability of the doctrine of claim preemption under Section 301 of the LMRA.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

This Court is the proper court for this matter because the events giving rise to this 4. petition, specifically, the entry of the Arbitrator's Interim Award, occurred in San Francisco, California.

3

9

& KUMAGAI LLP

20

21

17

18

25

23

- On or about July 2, 2001, PG&E and Hicks entered into a written Severance 6. Agreement and Release regarding Hicks' employment with PG&E and separation therefrom. Among other things, Hicks agreed to release PG&E from any claims, rights or privileges that he may have had relating to his employment with PG&E in exchange for valuable consideration, including a cash payment of \$67,520.59 to Hicks. A true and correct copy of this Severance Agreement and Release (hereafter referred to as "Hicks' Severance Agreement and Release") is hereto attached as Exhibit B and incorporated as if set forth herein by reference.
- 7. The Knowles' Severance Agreement and Release and the Hicks' Severance Agreement and Release (collectively referred to as "the Severance Agreements") both involve commerce because materials generated during Respondents' employment were used in commerce and PG&E was engaged in activities that affected commerce.
- 8. Under the Severance Agreements, Knowles and Hicks each agreed to hold PG&E harmless from actions, causes of action and claims relating to his employment with PG&E including those arising under federal, state or local laws relating to employment discrimination based on age, contract or tort. (Severance Agreements, ¶ 4) Further, Knowles and Hicks understood the release extended to all claims whatsoever, known or unknown, under section 1542 of the California Civil Code. (Severance Agreements, ¶ 5)
- 9. In Paragraph 6 of the Severance Agreements, Knowles and Hicks each promised "not to initiate, participate or aid, in any way, in any lawsuit or proceeding upon any claim released by him/her under this Severance Agreement and Release." They agreed that a violation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

| of this paragraph constituted a material breach of the Severance Agreements. | (Severance |
|--|------------|
| Agreements, ¶ 6) | |

- 10. In Paragraph 11 of the Severance Agreements, Knowles and Hicks agreed that "[alny dispute regarding any aspect of this Severance Agreement and Release, including its validity, interpretation, or any action which would constitute a violation of this Severance Agreement and Release (hereinafter referred to as an 'arbitrable dispute') shall be resolved by an experienced arbitrator "
- In Paragraph 15 of the Severance Agreements, Knowles and Hicks agreed that the 11. Severance Agreements fully superseded any and all prior agreements and understandings, and that any future agreements had to be contained in a writing executed by an authorized PG&E official. In Paragraph 16, Knowles and Hicks agreed that they understood the terms of the Severance Agreements, had been advised to seek legal counsel of their choosing, and that the only agreements made are those contained in the Severance Agreements. (Severance Agreements ¶¶ 15-16) Finally, Knowles and Hicks were warned as follows: "PLEASE READ CAREFULLY. THIS SEVERANCE AGREEMENT AND RELEASE INCLUDES A RELEASE OF ALL KNOWN AND UNKNOWN CLAIMS." (Severance Agreements, Pg. 5)

THE PRIOR CIVIL ACTIONS

- 12. On or about August 23, 2006, Knowles and Hicks filed a civil lawsuit against PG&E in the Superior Court for the State of California alleging breach of the Severance Agreements ("the first civil action"). PG&E removed the first civil action to this Court and, on or about October 30, 2006, Knowles and Hicks voluntarily dismissed the first civil action.
- 13. On or about April 26, 2007, Knowles and Hicks initiated a second civil action against PG&E in this Court entitled Thomas Knowles and Thomas Hicks v. Pacific Gas And Electric Company, Deanna Radford, and Does 1-20, Action No. C 07-2284, claiming breach of contract, breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and age discrimination ("the second civil action"). Knowles and Hicks sought damages for alleged denial of re-employment

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(415) 357-4605

benefits in the second civil action. The claims asserted in Knowles and Hicks' second civil action are identical to the claims asserted in the arbitration which is the subject of this Petition.

- 14. Knowles and Hicks' attempt to assert the identical claims and recover the identical relief in two forums (private arbitration and civil litigation) violates the primary right doctrine.
- 15. On or about July 30, 2007, PG&E filed a motion to dismiss the second civil action filed by Knowles and Hicks. On November 29, 2007, the Court granted PG&E's motion to dismiss because it determined that Respondents' claims were preempted by Section 301 of the LMRA. The Court accorded Respondents leave to amend to allege viable claims under the LMRA, if possible. A true and correct copy of the Court's Order Granting Defendant PG&E's Motion to Dismiss with Leave to Amend is hereto attached as Exhibit C and incorporated as if set forth herein by reference.
- 16. On or about December 5, 2007, Knowles and Hicks filed an Amended Complaint in the second civil action.
- 17. On or about December 26, 2007, PG&E filed a Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint in the second civil action.
- 18. PG&E's motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint in the second civil action will be heard on March 6, 2008.

CHALLENGED ARBITRATION AWARD

- 19. On or about January 12, 2007 (after filing and voluntarily dismissing the first civil action and before filing the second civil action), Respondents filed demands for arbitration with the American Arbitration Association alleging breach of written contract, specifically denial of alleged "promised employment benefits and preferential rights to re-employment" and age discrimination. Respondents later, on March 21, 2007, alleged the promise for preferential rehire rights was made orally, therefore, their claim included breach of an oral agreement.
- 20. PG&E filed a motion to dismiss the arbitration on June 8, 2007, based upon, among other grounds, preemption under Section 301 of the LMRA. PG&E also claimed the

¹ Petitioner is filing an Administrative Motion to Relate Cases pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(b) concurrently herewith.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

written contract did not provide a basis for arbitration. Respondents opposed the motion. Arbitrator Norman Brand of the American Arbitration Association (the "Arbitrator") held a hearing on August 14, 2007, in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, which is within the district in which this Court sits, at which both parties appeared and provided argument and evidence on PG&E's motion to dismiss.

- 21. At the hearing on PG&E's motion to dismiss, the Arbitrator requested that the parties provide supplemental briefing on the issue of whether preemption under Section 301 of the LMRA applied to the arbitration. Both parties provided supplemental briefing.
- 22. On December 3, 2007, in San Francisco, California, the Arbitrator made an Interim Award, in writing, granting in part and denying in part PG&E's motion to dismiss (the "Interim Award"). The Arbitrator's Interim Award was delivered to the parties. (A true and correct copy of the Interim Award is hereto attached as Exhibit D and incorporated as if set forth herein by reference.)
- 23. In making the Interim Award, the Arbitrator exceeded his powers and acted in manifest disregard of the law by finding that Respondents' claim for breach of an alleged oral promise of re-employment rights – a right that exists only under the CBA – and a companion claim for violation of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing could be arbitrated because the claim "does not assert any right allegedly created by" the CBA (Arbitration Award, Pg. 7) and "does not require [the arbitrator] to interpret the CBA." (Arbitration Award, Pg. 9) The Arbitrator recognized that any claim requiring interpretation of the CBA is preempted under Section 301 of the LMRA as demonstrated by his request for additional briefing on Section 301 preemption and his finding that Respondents "cannot arbitrate their rights under the CBA in this arbitration." (Arbitration Award, Pg. 9) The Arbitrator disregarded Section 301, however, in concluding that "there does not appear to be any basis for applying Section 301 to preemption to prevent arbitration of this claim." (Arbitration Award, Pg. 9)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Further, the Arbitrator erred in finding that the parties agreed to litigate a claim for breach of an oral contract. No written agreement exists or has ever been presented that demonstrates a mutual understanding that the parties would accept arbitration of a claim for breach of an oral contract.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner moves the Court for:

- 1. An order staying all arbitration proceedings pending the civil action;
- 2. An order vacating the Interim Arbitration award to the extent it denied Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss:
 - 3. Costs of suit and attorney fees; and
 - 4. Such other relief as the Court may see fit to grant.

Dated: February 27, 2008 LAFAYETTE & KUMAGAI LLP

Attorneys for Petitioner

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

N:\Documents\PGE\Know\Pldg\Petition to Vacate Arbitator's Award.doc